

REMARKS

Summary Of The Office Action

Claims 23-40 are pending in the application.

Claims 23, 26-27, 30, 34 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al (U.S. Patent 5,251,033).

Claims 24-25, 28-29, 31-33, 35-36 and 38-40 are objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Analysis of the Claim Rejections

In the present Office Action, claims 23, 26-27, 30, 34 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In rejecting claims 23, 26, 30, 34 and 37, the Examiner refers to Anderson, and more specifically to Fig. 1, element 24, col. 3, lines 24-40, Figs. 3-4, elements 24, col. 4, lines 1-56, as teaching the claimed feature of controlling the operation mode of the equalizer in response to identification of the direct current component of the received signal. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Anderson et al does not teach or suggest this claimed feature.

In more detail, Anderson et al has a unit 24 which produces a function $G(\omega)$ which includes 256 coefficients which are applied to inverse FFT unit 28. Unit 28 develops the function $g(t)$ comprising 256 coefficients. These coefficients correspond to the tap weight of a

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APP. NO. 09/078,555

256 tap equalizing transversal filter 30 which will correct for transmission channel distortions. Difference unit 20 determines the difference between the average value (i.e., the DC value) of the 256 samples from unit 16, and the average value during horizontal blanking intervals, and produces a DC difference representative signal DC DIFF.

FFT unit produces 256 transformed coefficients representing the frequency content of the transformed signal. One of the coefficients represents a DC value of the transformed signal. However, this coefficient is not utilized, rather, the DC DIFF difference developed by unit 20 is substituted for this coefficient. The remaining 255 coefficients developed by unit 18 and the DC DIFF difference representative signal from unit 20 are applied to unit 24. Thus, the DC response of the signal to be equalized is separately calculated independently of the FFT unit.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that Anderson et al merely teaches accurately detecting the DC level so as to accurately set the DC gain of the equalizer, and does not teach or suggest controlling the operating mode of the equalizer in response to the identification of the DC component of the received signal.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 23, 26-27, 30, 34 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al, at least for the reasons cited above.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.



RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APP. NO. 09/078,555

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Peter A. McKenna
Registration No. 38,551

Date: December 23, 2003